

WINDICATION  
OF THE  
*Reasons and Defence, &c.*

PRAYERS and DIRECTIONS

(Price Six-pence.)

LONDON, Printed for J. and W. T. B. 1748  
In Pall-mall near St. James's Church

Lt. J. R. S. and, M. of  
R. (Appendix)

VINDICATION  
OF THE  
Reasons and Defence, &c.

(Price Six-pence.)



A

845.6.8  
6

# VINDICATION

OF THE

*Reasons and Defence, &c.*

---

PART I.

---

BEING A

# R E P L Y

To the First Part of

*No Sufficient Reason*

For Restoring some

PRAYERS and DIRECTIONS

OF

King Edward VI's First LITURGY.

---

By the Author of the *Reasons and Defence.*

---

— Earnestly contend for the Faith which was once  
Delivered unto the Saints, Jude v. 3.

Δει δὲ καὶ ἐμπαύσαι κεχρημένους ἡ πόλις ἡμεῖς καὶ τὰς γενεὰς  
ἐπιβλέπει λαμβάνειν. διὰ τὰ μὴ εἶναι γενναίους, τὰ δὲ εἶναι  
παρρησιασμένους οἱ ἄγιοι Ἀπόστολοι S. Epiphani. Hæres. LXI.

---

LONDON: Printed for J. Bettenham at the Crown  
in Pater-Noster-Row. MDCCXVIII.



# VINDICATION

OF THE

*Reasons and Defence, &c.*



THE Learned Author of *No Sufficient Reason, &c.* (a) sets out with a formidable Title Page, paints the Defender, and the rest of his old Friends, in hideous Colours, reports them gone off from the *Inspir'd Writings*, and consequently plain Deserters from true Christianity. What else can be the Meaning of these two Texts planted against them? *In vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.* (b) He said unto them, *Full well ye reject the Commandments of God, that ye may keep your own Tradition.* Here's no remote Insinuation, no glancing Suggestion, nothing left to Guessing and Ambiguity: No; the Articles of Impeachment run high, the Implication is direct, and the Charge strikes full upon the Party. We are, it seems, as unhappy as the old Pharisees, we set up *Tradition* in Opposition to *Scripture*, and over-rule the Divine Laws by Human Authority: We are just like

---

(a) Part I.

(b) *S. Mark, vii. v. 7. and v. 9.*

Those (tho' much deeper in Guilt) who plead obsolete Customs and Precedents against the Sense of the Legislature, and the open Directions of the Statute-Book. Yes, says our Learned Author, *we are now taught to betake ourselves not to Scripture, but Tradition, the Fathers, and the Jewish Rab- bies, which tho' all of use, are by no means to be set in Opposition to it* (c). As much as to say, where Scripture teaches one thing, and Tradition ano- ther, we govern our Practice and Belief by the lat- ter Rule. This is to exceed the Doctrine of the Council of Trent, which he is so kind as to put up- on us (d). For the Trentin Synod does not give a Preference to Tradition: They only set it on an equal Foot of Authority, and decree it to be receiv'd *pari pietatis affectu & reverentia* (e).

And since the Accusation goes thus deep, ought not the Evidence to have been proportionably clear? But has this Gentleman produc'd any Pas- sage from the *Reasons* or *Defence*, which sets up Tradition in competition with the Canon, and gives it an Authority paramount to the *written Word*? No, Nothing of this kind can be found. Are not such Imputations then, to speak softly, some- what unaccountable? May it not fairly be ex- pected, since the Proof is wanting, the Charge should be retracted? As to the matter in Hand, the *Defender's* Persuasion is this:

1<sup>st</sup>, Where there's any plain Opposition and Contrariety between Scripture and Tradition, there the Scripture is to be follow'd.

(c) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. Part I. p. 3.

(d) *Ib.* p. 5.

(e) *Sess.* 4.



2dly, That no such plain Contradiction is to be found where Tradition appears early and general.

3dly, That Tradition is necessary to explain some Passages of *Scripture*, where the Sense is not clear and indisputable. And that without this supplemental Assistance, neither the Necessity of *Infant-Baptism*, nor the Obligation to keep *Sunday*, can be made out.

4thly, That without Tradition we can't prove the *Old* and *New Testament* the Word of God.

5thly, That where the Tradition for Christian Worship is equally early and general with that which vouches some part of the *Canon* of the *New Testament*, there the Ground and Original of such Worship must be allow'd the same Credit: For where the Attestation is equal, the Authority must be so too (f).

Having premis'd this, I am to acquaint the Reader, that most of the Objections in our Author's *First Part*, which carry the best Face of an Argument, have receiv'd a *Reply* in two Learned Books (g), publish'd three Months before the *Second Part* of his *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. appear'd. But of these two *Traacts* he has taken no Notice, for Reasons best known to himself. The Case standing thus, my Business with the *First Part* of our Author's Undertaking will be short. And therefore when I pass over any thing he has offer'd, 'tis because I am happily prevented by

(f) See Defence, &c.

(g) *Tradition Necessary to explain the Holy Scriptures, &c. The Necessity of an Alteration, &c.*

those two Learned Gentlemen, to whom, and to the Defence, &c. the Reader is then referr'd.

Our Learned Author has not thought fit to rely wholly upon the Strength of his *Matter*, without some Assistance from his *Manner*. He endeavours to prepossess the Reader with the Unanswerableness of his Performance; and that no Opposition is able to stand before it. To give some of this Confiding Language, some of these Strains of Satisfaction, in his own Words.

He may try his Skill in confuting it, but I believe he had as good let it alone (h). Wretchedly precarious, having no Foundation except in our Author's own Imagination (i). He has not been able to prove the contrary, nor ever will (k). He neither has shew'd, nor can shew (l). They who will not be satisfied with this, (that is his Reasoning about the Oblation) must seek out a New Gospel (m).

But now the Enquiry may be, what Occasion he met with to furnish this New Ceremony, what Warrant there is to hang out all this Demonstration, and whether he has not made out more Sail than his Ballast will allow.

Our Learned Author produces the Testimony of Archbishop *Laud* to prove the Scripture contains all things necessary to Salvation (n). This is granted, provided 'tis interpreted in doubtful places by the Doctrine and Practice of the Pri-

---

(h) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. Part II. p. 56.

(i) *Id.* p. 66. (k) *Id.* p. 101. (l) *Ibid.* (m) *Id.* p. 110.

(n) *Laud against Fisher*, Sect. II. Num. 2. *No Sufficient Reason*, Part I. p. 5.

mitive Church. This Condition is implied in the Archbishop's Proposition ; for these are his Words : *If there be any doubt about the Faith, and in which we are to find the thing that is to be believed, as necessary in the Faith, we never did, nor never will refuse any Tradition that is Universal and Apostolical, for the better Exposition of the Scripture* (o).

This Concession supposes some *Apostolical Traditions* remaining in the Church : And in the next Paragraph, speaking in the Name of the Church of England, he declares, *we are content to be judged by the joint and constant Belief of the Fathers which liv'd within the first four or five hundred years after Christ, when the Church was at the best, and by the Councils held in those Times.* This Learned Prelate is willing to resign to the Authority of the Fathers and Councils to the End of the fifth Century : But the Authors of the *No Reason* and *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. won't allow the consentient Testimony of two and there *Ages old enough* for this purpose.

Farther ; the Archbishop, by this Concession, was inevitably bound to receive the Decree of the third Council of *Carthage* for the *Mixture*. For this Council sat in the fourth Century, which falls within the Archbishop's Period. And to acquaint the Reader with something more of this Prelate's Opinion with reference to the present Controversy, it may not be amiss to mention his *praying* that God would make all the Re-

formed Churches as well as the Church of *England*, and as much better as he pleas'd (p). This Archbishop had likewise the Direction of the *Scottish Common-Prayer Book*, where the *Communion-Office* is alter'd to a more Primitive Form, where all those that are of the Mystical Body of Christ are pray'd for, where the Ancient Clause for invoking the Holy Ghost is inserted in the *Consecration Prayer*, where the Memorial or Prayer of Oblation is made before the Distribution of the *Elements*, where the Collect of humble Access follows next, and where the Words of Distribution are the same with those in our *First Reformed Liturgy*, without the Addition now standing in the Second.

These Alterations being charg'd by the *Scottish Commissioners* as an Approach towards Popery; the Archbishop, at his Trial, defends himself by alledging, " That the Church is only burnish'd and refin'd by the *Reformation*, and not melted down, and made a new one : That provided there's nothing superstitious or unlawful retain'd, the less Alteration from the *Ancient Service*, the better.

" And when these *Commissioners* urg'd the *Scottish Book* had inverted the Order of the *Communion* in the *English Liturgy*, the Archbishop amongst other things replies, " That the *Scottish Liturgy* in this respect comes nearer the *Primitive Church* than the *English*, and for that reason ought to have the Preference : And for this he appeals to the Judgment of the Learned,



" From hence he inferrs a great deal of *Will* and  
 " *Weakness* in those who call this a *New Commu-*  
 " *nion*, only because some of the Prayers are  
 " removed from their former Situation.

" The Managers of the Tryal objected the  
 " *Oblation of an Unbloody Sacrifice*, as another Cor-  
 " *ruption* in the *Scottish Liturgy*: And this, they  
 " pretended, was *Bellarmino's Doctrine*. The  
 " Arch-Bishop's Answer is, that if *Bellarmino*  
 " means no more by the Oblation of the Body  
 " and Blood of Christ, than a *Commemorative Re-*  
 " *presentation* of that great Sacrifice upon the  
 " Cross, the Cardinal is in the right, as Bishop  
 " *Jewell* freely acknowledges. As for the Ob-  
 " *lation of the Elements*, 'tis fit and proper, as the  
 " Arch-Bishop continues, and he is sorry we  
 " have it not in the *Book of England* (r).

By this Sketch, our Author may easily guess  
 the Arch-Bishop's Sentiments, and what little Suc-  
 cour can be expected from this Quarter.

The *Defender* endeavour'd to shew *Tradition*  
 recommended by Scripture itself (r). The *Texts*  
 are these: *Therefore, Brethren, stand fast, and hold*  
*the Traditions you have been taught, whether by Word,*  
*or our Epistle. Hold fast the form of sound Words*  
*which thou hast heard of me. Keep the Ordinances*  
*as I delivered them to you* (r). Now don't the  
 Apostle make a plain Distinction between what  
 was convey'd by Writing, and what was deliver'd

(r) *History of the Troubles, &c. of Arch-Bishop Laud. p. 115,*  
 124.

(s) *Defence, &c. p. 18, 19.*

(t) *2 Thess. ii. 15. 2 Tim. i. 13. 1 Cor. xi. 2.*

to his Converts by word of Mouth? And are they not equally enjoyn'd to govern themselves by both Directions?

But, says this Learned Gentleman: *How a Form of sound Words, taught by S. Paul, can denote such Practices, as have nothing to be pleaded for them, but the Authority of such as lived after the Apostle's Death, is a Discovery I am not yet acquainted with (u).* Is it then so strange a Discovery, that the First Christians should remember what the Apostles taught them either by Preaching or private Instruction? Were they so regardless of what concern'd their everlasting Salvation? Or did they think nothing of this kind significant, unless receiv'd from the Apostles in Writing? Why then did S. Paul tell the Elders of Ephesus, That he had declared to them the whole Counsel of God? And which way was this done? Not by his Epistle at that time: But by teaching them publicly, and from house to house, for the space of three Years (x). If therefore what the Apostles preach'd was not too big for the Memory of their Hearers, we may imagine they would take the best care they could not to forget. And that the Conveyance might be carry'd on to future Generations, they would not fail to govern themselves by S. Paul's Direction: *The things which thou hast heard of me among many Waneſſes, the ſame commit thou to faithful Men, who ſhall be able to teach others alſo (y).* And if this was done, why is not the Testimony of such as lived after the

(u) *No ſufficient Reason, &c.* p. 25.

(x) *Acts* xx. 20, 27.

(y) *2 Tim.* ii. 2.

Apostles Death a good Authority? That this is not only practicable, but matter of Fact, *S. Irenaeus* assures us. This *Father*, who liv'd in the latter end of the second Century, declares that Churches were continued, and the whole System of the Christian Religion preserv'd, without the *Canon* of the *New Testament*. His Words are these: "What if the Apostles had left us no Scriptures? Ought we not to have govern'd our Belief and Practice by the Rule of that Tradition, which They deliver'd to Those with whom they entrusted the Government of the Churches? 'Tis by this Traditional Instruction, that a great many unletter'd Nations are good Believers, and continue their Orthodoxy, without the Conveyance of Paper and Ink. — These People, who were made Christians without written Assistance, may be call'd Barbarous, if you please, because not Book-Learn'd: But with respect to Sentiment, to good Customs, and Conversation, they stand in the first Rank of Wisdom, and serve God through every Branch of Duty (y). Thus this learned and primitive *Father* was far from believing *Oral Tradition* so exceedingly liable to Error, that no wise Man would depend upon it in a matter of any Consequence: As our Author will have it (z). For we see whole Nations, without Reproof, ventur'd their eternal Interest upon this Bottom.

(y) *Iren. Lib. 3. cap. 41 Edit. Grabe.*

(z) *No sufficient Reason, &c. part 2. p. 66.*

But our learned Author can't understand how a *Form of sound Words*, taught by *S. Paul*, can denote such *Practices* as have nothing to plead but the Authority of those who lived after the Apostles Death. To this I answer,

1<sup>st</sup>, That these *Practices* have Authority from *Scripture* itself, as interpreted by the Testimony and Usages of the Ancient Church.

2<sup>dly</sup>, I would gladly know why this *Form of sound Words* must not relate to *Practice*. Did *S. Paul's* Doctrine consist only of Speculation? Does he not command his Converts to *walk worthy of their Calling, and to work out their Salvation?* He tells us the great End of our Saviour's Incarnation and Suffering was to *redeem us from all Iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar People, zealous of good Works* (a). Thus all Points of Belief are suppos'd given for the Directions of Life, and the Improvement of Manners. There's therefore no reason to question but that *S. Paul's Form of sound Words* contain'd Regulations for Practice; and that this Form was deliver'd to instruct *S. Timothy* in his Pastoral Function, and how he ought to behave himself in the House of God (b). But

3<sup>dly</sup>, This Learned Author's Objection goes somewhat farther. He does not think the Testimony of those who lived after the Apostles Death, a good Authority for Apostolical Practice. What not if They liv'd in the same Age with *S. John*? Not for the most solemn Parts of the Christian Worship? Not for the Holy Eucharist, which, if

---

(a) *Th. ii. 14.*

(b) *1 Tim. iii. 15.*



not oftner, was administred every *Sunday*? If a Testimony thus confining upon the Apostles; thus general in the Custom, thus circumstantiated to Advantage, is defective Authority, I'm afraid 'twill be difficult to find good Proof for something else of the greatest Importance. For if we refuse resigning to an Evidence with all these Marks of Truth, I can't see what can command our Assent in other Matters: If the Testimony of those who lived (tho' a very little while) after the Apostles Death, can't sufficiently inform us what the Apostles practis'd in the most material Parts of Religion, 'twill not be an easy Task to shew how such Testimony can assure us what the Apostles have written. For the Ground of our believing the *Old and New Testament* inspir'd Writings, stands upon Traditionary Evidence: Our Learned Author confesses, *that we are indebted to Tradition for our Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures* (c). And what is *Tradition*, but the successive Testimony of those who liv'd after the *Death of the Apostles*? And were it possible to destroy the Credit of such Authority, the *Sacred Records* must suffer with it.

This Learned Author cites a Text (d), to prove *S. Paul gives us Directions to stick to Scripture, as of itself sufficient to lead us to Salvation* (e).

---

(c) *No sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 34.

(d) *2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.*

(e) *No sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 25.

In this, with Arch-Bishop *Laud*, I agree with him, so far as to acknowledge that the *Scripture*, interpreted by the Catholick Church of the first four or five *Centuries*, is sufficient to lead us to *Salvation*. But then I must subjoin, that this *Text* is misapply'd, and falls short of this Gentleman's Purpose. For,

1<sup>st</sup>, The *Scripture* S. *Paul* refers to, is the *Old Testament*; as appears by his putting S. *Timothy* in mind that from a *Child* he had known the *Holy Scriptures* (f): Now, when S. *Timothy* was a *Child*, very little, if any Part of the *New Testament*, was written: 'Tis therefore the *Jewish Canon* which is plainly pointed at in this place. This *Scripture* the Apostle tells his Disciple was able to make him *Wise unto Salvation through Faith in Christ Jesus*. That is, by reading the *Old Testament*, he might see the Predictions and Character of the *Messiah* plainly answer'd in our Blessed Saviour. And that these Prophecies, thus fulfill'd, were good Arguments of the Truth of Christianity.

2<sup>dly</sup>, When S. *Paul* penn'd this Epistle to S. *Timothy*, several Parts of the *New Testament* were not communicated by Writing. And of these, if we can go no farther, we may reckon the *Gospel* and *Epistles* of S. *John*, together with the *Revelations*. If therefore what was written before, was sufficient, won't these later Writings appear somewhat unnecessary? And will any body be so hardy, as to affirm this?

---

(f) *Id.* ver. 15.

3dly, To suppose S. Paul confin'd S. Timothy to written Direction, is to make the Apostle enjoin Contradictions, and that in the same Chapter (g). For here he commands him to *commit to faithful Men the things that he had heard of him among many Witnesses*. 'Tis likewise direct Clashing with what he had commanded in the first Chapter of the same Epistle (h). And thus we see this Text is altogether unserviceable to what our Author produced it.

His next Business is to put an expostulating Question: *What, says he, if our Saviour only enjoins us to offer up our Eucharistical Sacrifice, according to his own Institution (i)?* Then without doubt we are to obey, and keep close to it. But here our Complaint is, that this Author and his Adherents don't offer 'the Eucharistick Sacrifice entirely according to our Saviour's Institution. This we think has been made good already, and shall be farther taken Notice of when the Article comes up. He charges us with maintaining, that the *Sacrifice must be offer'd in a certain unscriptural Form, or else 'tis no Sacrament (k)*. The Defender has never said 'tis no Sacrament: But is much afraid that the Omission of the Invocating Part, and Postponing the Oblatory Prayer to the Distribution, are maiming Circumstances, and may weaken the Benefit of the Sacrament.

But this Gentleman objects, we insist upon an *unscriptural Form (l)*. To this I answer, 1st, That

(g) 2 Tim. iii. 2.

(h) 2 Tim. i. 13.

(i) No Sufficient Reason, &amp;c. p. 26.

(k) Ibid.

(l) Ibid.

the Churches already mention'd by *S. Irenaeus*, subsisted upon Tradition without any Scriptural Form; they subsisted thus, I say, in a good Condition, till the latter End of the second Century, and might do so much longer for ought appears to the contrary.

2dly, I must observe that our Eucharistick Form is more *Scriptural* than that he contends for (m).

But after all, is this Learned Author against all *Unscriptural Forms*? And does the using such Forms imply an Opposition to the *written Word*? (n). If this is his Opinion, as his Reasoning seems to infer, he is no *genuine Son*, as he calls himself (o), of the *Church of England*; for that Church has a great many *Unscriptural Forms* in her *Divine Service*; and upon this Score the *Puritans* have frequently declaim'd against Her.

The *Defender* observ'd, that the Necessity of *Infant-Baptism* stands upon the Foot of *Tradition*; and that there is no demonstrative Evidence in *Scripture*, either of Command, or Instance, for this Practice. This Assertion, after some Fencing and Contradiction, is granted by this Gentleman. He tells us, 'tis readily own'd, that the Practice of the Church is a good corroborating Evidence, and makes the Necessity of it more apparent and unquestionable (p). Now, if the Practice of the Church, that is *Tradition*, is a good corroborating Evidence, then this Evidence, without such Corroborating, as he calls it, was not sufficiently Substantial. For that

(m) See *Defence*, &c. *The Necessity of an Alteration*, &c.

(n) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 26.

(o) *Id.* p. 1,

(p) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 27.



Truth which is fortify'd by additional Strength, is plainly defective without it. And if the Necessity of any Duty is made *more apparent and unquestionable* by Tradition, does it not inevitably follow that in case such Proof was withdrawn, the Matter would be left dubious and disputable? That which is sufficiently clear, wants no Illustration, no supplemental Arguments, nothing to make it more convincing, than 'tis already.

Our Learned Author excepts to *S. Justin Martyr's* Testimony, *as not being early enough to speak for the First Century* (q). His Reason is, *because he flourish'd not till about the Middle of the next Age*. Let this be examin'd a little. *S. Justin*, as the famous *Mr. Tillemont* observes, wrote his *Dia-logue against Trypho*, A. D. 155. five Years after the *Apology* now under Debate. And the same Author supposes him probably born A. D. 103, that is, when the Apostle *S. John* was living (r). Now if our Learned Objector will refuse this Martyr Twenty years Christianity when he wrote his second *Apology*, I persuade myself he will readily allow him Ten. Taking this then for granted, *S. Justin* must be a Christian in the year 140, that is thirty seven years after the Death of *S. John*. Now by this Computation, 'tis plain that many Persons of the *First Century* must be living. And supposing none of them above Sixty years old, they must have been Twenty three when *S. John* died. And were they then not in a Condition to tell whether the Eucharistick Cup which they re-

(q) *No Sufficient Reason*, Sec. p. 37.

(r) *Tillemont Memoires*, Tom. II. p. 258, 642.

receiv'd, was *mist* or not? And can we imagine, that a Person of *S. Justin's* Religious and Inquisitive Temper, did not converse with several Persons of this Age, and enquire concerning the most solemn Usages in the Christian Worship? And if the *Mixture* had been any Innovation upon the *Institution*, we have all imaginable Reason to suppose they would have acquainted him with it. And if this had been done, he would never have mention'd it with Approbation in his second *Apology*. And farther, from this Chronology we fairly conclude, that *Justin Martyr* receiv'd the Eucharist with many Christians of the first Age, and by Consequence must be an unexceptionable Evidence for that *Century*.

His Argument against the *Mixture*, from *Balsamon's* reporting the Greek Church puts warm Water in the Cup, is already answer'd (s). All that I shall observe is, that the putting warm Water into the Eucharistick Cup, is neither practis'd nor mention'd by the *Coptick*, *Syrian*, nor *Aethiopian Jacobites*, nor yet by the *Nestorians*. Now the *Nestorians* went off from the Catholick Church, at the Council of *Ephesus*; and the *Jacobites*, sometimes call'd *Eutychians*, at the Council of *Chalcedon*. This Custom therefore in the Greek Church of putting warm Water into the Eucharistick Cup, tho' after the Consecration with the *Mixture*; this Custom, I say, was posterior to the General Council of *Chalcedon*, and is

(s) *The Necessity of an Alteration, &c. p. 66. Vid. Goat, Eucholog. p. 61, 76, 82.*

first mention'd by *Germanus* Patriarch of *Constantinople* (t).

The Author of *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. (u) thinks *Justin Martyr's* Authority is mounted too high. The *Defender*, says he, tells us, " that this *Father*, where he gives the Emperor an Account that the Bread, and Wine, and Water were Eucharistiz'd or Bless'd, adds, that our Saviour commanded his Apostles to celebrate in the same Manner. Very well ! the *Defender* says so still, and appeals to the *Martyr's Apology*, for the Truth of the Report (w). Thus far then there's no harm : But now the Blow comes ; for the *Defender*, it seems, could not well have said more, if he had look'd upon *S. Justin's Apology* as Canonical Scripture (x). This is somewhat extraordinary. 'Tis true, *Justin Martyr* in two places (besides the contested one of the *Krama*) acquaints the Emperor, " that Bread, Wine, and Water were bless'd and receiv'd. That the Apostles in their Commentaries, or Gospels, declar'd our Saviour commanded them to do so. And that in Imitation of this Institution, the Devils taught the Worshippers of *Mithra*, to offer Bread and Water in their Sacrifices. Now *S. Justin Martyr* living so early in *Palestine*, where Christianity first appear'd ; and having (as may most reasonably be suppos'd) convers'd with several who had both seen, and communicated with

(t) *Renaudot. Liturg. Orient. Tom. I. p. 294, 295.*

(u) *Pag. 49.*

(w) *Justin, Apol. 2. p. 27, 28. Edit. Colon.*

(x) *No Sufficient Reason, &c. p. 49.*

the Apostles ; this consider'd, he may very well pass for a good Witness : But then the alledging the Unexceptionableness of his Evidence does by no means suppose him inspir'd. Does the citing an ancient *Father*, and arguing from his Testimony, make him the Pen-man of the Holy Ghost, and enter his Writings upon the *Rolls* of the *Canon* ? If so, then this Gentleman, by calling in the *Fathers* to his Assistance, has enlarg'd the Catalogue of the *Inspir'd* Writings much farther than the Council of *Trent*. And since this Reasoning is extravagantly wide of the purpose, 'twill follow that our Learned Author has unhappily misreported the *Defender*, by inferentially charging him with asserting, that *our Faith in this Point is not to be resolv'd into the Doctrine of the Scriptures, but into the Sayings of Justin Martyr, and other Ecclesiastical Writers* (y). And thus, tho' our Author has *taken Time enough to write deliberately*, which he complains the *Defender* did not (z), he has notwithstanding been somewhat unlucky with his Leisure ; for he fails both in Cogency and Justice.

The Author of *No Reason, &c.* was remark'd for citing *Papias's* receiving the *Millenary Tradition* from the Apostles : This, the *Defender* observ'd, " was some Mistake in representing the Matter (a). This Mistake is endeavour'd to be turn'd upon the *Defence, &c.* I shall therefore transcribe the Words in the *No Reason, &c.* and leave them with the Reader. " He,

(y) *No Sufficient Reason, &c.* p. 49.

(z) *Ibid.*

(a) *Defence, &c.* p. 12.

(*Papias*)



(Papias) " was very inquisitive what S. Andrew, S. Peter, S. Philip, and others of the Apostles had said, and told of many Traditions he had thus receiv'd, as from them (b). Now if the most natural Construction of these Words does not suppose Papias receiv'd many Traditions from the Apostles, I think *English* is somewhat unintelligible. This Learned Objector seems a little apprehensive the Passage might not be interpreted to his Sense, and therefore comes up with a Reserve. If the Answerer, says he, had said what the Defender charges him with, he had not been without some Countenance for it from Irenæus, who calls him the Hearer of S. John (c). He does say indeed, Papias was S. John's Auditor. But what John? Not S. John the Apostle; this Father affirms nothing of that (d). Eusebius then, who saw Papias's Writings, must explain this Matter. Now this Historian reports expressly, that Papias does not say he convers'd with any of the Apostles; but that he enquir'd what S. Matthew, S. John, &c. had orally deliver'd to those who knew them: And that the John to whom himself was a Hearer, was John the Presbyter or Elder, who is plainly distinguish'd from the Apostle (e).

This Learned Gentleman, and the Author of *No Reason*, &c. can't agree about S. Cyprian's Doctrine concerning the Mixture. The *No Reason*, &c. (f) with great Ingenuity confesses S. Cyprian

(b) *No Reason*, &c. p. 8.

(c) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 67.

(d) *Iren. Lib. V. c. 33.*

(e) *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. III. c. 39.*

(f) *Pag. 6.*

is very positive for the Use of the Water, as of our Saviour's own Institution. This won't be allow'd by his Learned Assistant. No: He is so free as to charge the Answerer with Haste, and Want of due Consideration (g); and thus like Ships in a Night-Storm, they fall foul upon each other. However, continues the No Sufficient Reason, &c. (h) 'Tis not too late to set the Matter in a better Light. But that this Light will misguide the Traveler, and it may be lead him into a Bog, I shall make as clear as the Sun. And now having promis'd as high, I hope to prove as well as this Learned Objector. The Places, some of which have been already cited (i), are these. In sanctificando calice Domini, offerri aqua sola non potest, quomodo nec vinum solum potest. ----- Calix Domini non est aqua sola, aut vinum SOLUM, nisi utrumque sibi misceatur. ----- Post cœnam mixtum calicem obtulit Dominus. ----- In sacrificio quod Christus obtulerit, non nisi Christus sequendus est: Utique id nobis obaudire & facere oportet, quod Christus fecit, & quod faciendum esse mandavit (k). In English thus: In consecrating the Cup of our Lord, we ought no more to offer Water alone, than Wine alone. ----- The Cup of our Lord is neither Water alone, nor Wine alone, but consists of both mixt together. ----- Our Lord offer'd a mixt Cup after Supper. ----- In the Sacrifice which Christ offer'd, Christ's Precedent is only to be follow'd; For 'tis our Duty to obey and practise that which

(g) No Sufficient Reason, &c. p. 64, 65.

(h) Ibid.

(i) Reasons, &c. The Necessity of an Alteration, &c.

(k) Cyprian. Epist. 63. p. 154. Edit. Oxon.

*Christ both did and commanded to be done.* If all this is not demonstrative Evidence, that *S. Cyprian* is decisive for the *Mixture*, and that he firmly believ'd it our Lord's Institution, the *Reader* must despair of ever understanding any Author; for the Martyr has here express'd himself in Words as clear and determining as 'tis possible.

To proceed: The *Answerer of the Reasons*, &c. argued from our Saviour's being an Antitype of *Melchizedeck*, that 'twas more likely he conform'd to his Manner of Sacrificing, than to the *Paschal* Custom of the *Jews*. And to apply this Reasoning, he adds, that *Melchizedeck* offer'd nothing that we know of, but Bread and Wine. To this the *Defender*, amongst other things, return'd, that 'twas most probable *Melchizedeck* offer'd what was generally drank in those warm Climates, which was, and is still, Wine diluted. And that this is the Usage, any Traveller, and particularly the *Factories* at *Aleppo* and *Smyrna*, may satisfy him. In these Places drinking Wine undiluted is not only reckon'd Singularity, but a Mark of Intemperance. And to fortify the Reasoning that *Melchizedeck* offer'd diluted Wine, the *Defender* observ'd, that those who assisted at the Sacrifice, refresh'd themselves with the consecrated Entertainment. In Answer to this our Learned Author wonders *People can't refresh themselves with Wine, unless Water is mixt with it* (1). But here he seems to forget his Northern Country, and the Elevation of the Pole he lies under. Had this

---

(1) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 84.

Recollection been made, he would not have offer'd his Appeal to an *English* Palate, *whether a Glass of Wine without Water has not at least as much Refreshment, as with it*: For if he had re-fer'd the Decision to the *Palestine* Jews, who ought to have been the Judges, because the Practice contested was in their Country: If the Case, I say, had been re-fer'd to these Judges, the Sentence would have gone against him: For they plainly tell us, diluted Wine was more pleasant than unmixt, and look'd on it as an Emblem of their Freedom from the *Egyptian* Slavery (m).

The *Defender*, with respect to *Melchizedeck*, observ'd farther, that there is no Necessity the Type and Antitype should agree and be the same in every Particular. And this Assertion was prov'd by the Instance of *Joshua*. Our Learned Author grants this, but then objects, that *Joshua* was no farther a Type of our Blessed Saviour, than by bringing the *Israelites* into *Canaan* (n). But then it must be allow'd, that our Saviour was *Joshua's* Antitype in the Conquest and Success: Here, as our Author speaks (o), *Joshua* did most *Emphatically* typify our Lord; and therefore, as he continues, the Antitype is not any way to differ from the Type in this respect (p). And if this Gentleman insists upon a Punctuality of Circumstances, 'twill follow that our Saviour should have set up an *Evangelium armatum*, fought his Enemies, as *Joshua* did, and form'd his Church with the

(m) *Lightfoot's Temple Service*, p. 961.

(n) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 86.

(o) *Ib.* p. 85.

(p) *Ibid.*



Assistance of Fire and Sword. But if our *Author* grants there's no Necessity for the Sameness or exact Resemblance of the Emblem to what it represents, then his Argument from *Melchizedeck* must be dropt: *Because, tho' Melchizedeck's Bread and Wine did emphatically typify the Eucharistick Elements* (q); yet there's no necessity but that some Difference may be between them: And that supposing, (which is far from being prov'd) *Melchizedeck* sacrificed with undiluted Wine, 'twill by no means follow, that the Eucharistick Cup must be consecrated without the *Mixture*.

Our Learned Answerer thinks the *Drink-Offering among the Jews*, tho' never drank, *seems not improperly succeeded by the Cup in the Eucharist* (r). *Seems not improperly*. This Diffidence and slender Reliance is suitable to the Inconclusiveness of what is offer'd. For, 1<sup>st</sup>, He has not prov'd that the Drink-Offering was not the same which was commonly drank, that is, Wine diluted.

2<sup>dly</sup>, Our Blessed Saviour's Sacrifice upon the Cross was an Antitype of the *Paschal Lamb*: *S. Paul* speaks expressly, that *Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us* (s). And 'twas the Passover our Lord kept, and no other *Jewish* Solemnity, at the Institution of the Eucharist; we have therefore no Reason to believe the Eucharistick Cup was instituted upon a Resemblance of the *Drink-Offering*, and not upon what was drank at the *Paschal Solemnity*.

---

(q) *Ibid.*

(r) *No Sufficient Reason, &c. p. 87:*

(s) *1 Cor. v. 7:*

3dly, Our Learned Author himself has destroy'd this Resemblance of the Drink-Offering: For he asserts *Melchizedeck's Bread and Wine was most emphatically typified by the Eucharistick Cup* (t). And if so, the Eucharistick Antitype must carry a peculiar Resemblance to what was offer'd by *Melchizedeck*: And thus our Lord, being a Priest after the Order of *Melchizedeck* (u), the Representative Sacrifice instituted by him, is made in the same Kind, and without preferable Reference to the Rites of the Priesthood of a different and expiring Order.

The Learned Author of *No Reason, &c.* (x) fairly owns the Third Council of Carthage decreed the Administring with the Mixture, and believ'd it Necessary. This Concession our Objector thinks too much, and rather than come into it, ventures to contradict himself. For towards the beginning of his Book, he cites several Texts to prove *παρεδωκεν*, translated *Deliver'd*, in the New Testament (y), signifies *Taught*, and imports *Doctrine*. Now this *παρεδωκεν*, or *tradidit*, is the Term made use of by the Council. This worthy Gentleman, finding himself press'd, excepts to the Translation of the *Reasons and Defence, &c.* combats his own Exposition, and tells us, that *quam ipse Dominus tradidit*, should not be construed as *our Lord himself Appointed*, but *which our Lord himself Delivered*; which, as he continues, is of far less Importance, and does not imply an Appointment:

(t) *No Sufficient Reason, &c.* p. 85.

(u) *Hebr. vii. 17.*

(x) *No Reason, &c.* p. 27.

(y) *1 Cor. xi. 23. xv. 3. Jude 3. No Sufficient Reason, &c.*

What did our Lord deliver it for then? Was it not to be practis'd and obey'd? Our Author's Title-Page Citation from S. Cyprian may decide this Matter, *debemus attendere quid ante omnes Christus prior fecerit.* — Which Text is mention'd by the *Martyr* to prove the *Necessity* of the *Mixture*. For here he makes our Saviour's Precedent, tho' we had nothing farther, equivalent to a Command (z). But farther, were our Learned Author's new Interpretation allow'd; did the Word *Deliver'd* fall short of *Appointment*, in the common Signification; this would do him no manner of Service: For 'tis certain what our Saviour *Deliver'd* at the Institution of the Eucharist, is plainly an Injunction to succeeding Ages, because he commanded the Apostles to *do* what he had done: If therefore he *Deliver'd* the *Mixture*, as the *Council* declares, 'tis undoubtedly a perpetually binding Order upon the Church.

The *Defender* having the Council of *Carthage*, held in the 4th Century, demonstratively on his side, ask'd, "If the unanimous Resolution of a whole *Synod* was not considerable Evidence (a)? To this our Learned *Objector* replies, *Be it so*, yet considerable and sufficient Evidence are very different. Here the Word *considerable* won't pass; and, it seems, the Modesty of the Expression destroys the Force of the Argument. And here he brings in the Testimony of a single Witness in the Case of High Treason, as a Counterbalance to the

(z) S. Cyprian. Ep. 63. ad Cecil. *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 91.

(a) *Defence*, &c. p. 34.

Authority of the *Council of Carthage*: And because the First is insufficient, the Latter must be so too. That is, one Witness, it may be of obscure Condition, is of equal Credit to that of a hundred Bishops met upon the most solemn Occasion, and pronouncing upon a Case which they were well qualify'd to *understand*; and where we ought reasonably to conclude, they would not have been so decisive, without proportionable Evidence.

This worthy Gentleman refers it to the *Defender's* Conscience, whether the Translation of the 32d Canon of the *Trullan Council*, given in the *No Reason*, &c. is not the natural and genuine Sense of those Fathers (b). To this the *Defender* answers, his Conscience will by no means give him leave to believe this. He can't believe the *Council* out of their Wits, which they must have been, if that *Author's* Translation was their genuine Sense (c). However, if this Learned *Objector* won't allow an Omission of the Word *Not*, to save Appearances, to ward off Cavilling and Contradiction, and reconcile the *Council* more easily to common Sense; if he insists, after all, upon a Literal Translation, there has one been given him, with a Counter-Meaning to that offer'd by himself (d).

And now, since he lays the Matter to the *Defender's* Conscience, I must put it a little to his own. I ask him therefore, whether his falling in with

---

(b) *No sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 93.

(c) See *Defence*, &c. p. 39.

(d) *The Necessity of an Alteration*, &c. p. 203, 204.



the *Answerer's* Construction; his making the *Trullan Fathers* forbid the *Mixture* they had been pleading for before. from so many solemn Authorities; and after they had condemn'd the *Armenians* for administring the Eucharistick Cup without mixing Water with the Wine; whether their forbidding the *Mixture* after all this Censure, Reasoning, and Declaration for it, is not to expound the *Council* into Nonsense and Distraction? The famous Commentators *Balsamon*, *Zonaras*, and *Aristenus*, Members of the *Eastern Church*, not many Ages remote, and to whom *Greek* was the native Language: These Learned Commentators, I say, construe the *Council* to Consistency, and give no signs of any Difficulty in the Meaning. Farther, the *Trullan Fathers*, we may observe, made above 100 Canons; and yet, neither the *Answerer*, nor this Author, offer to charge them with Dotage and Self-Contradiction in any other Passage. And is it not very extraordinary, that their Brains should be thus suddenly blasted and recover'd! that they should be thus totally Eclips'd in one place, and shine Bright in all the rest! 'Tis somewhat unusual to strike them out of all Claim to Reason, and bring a Commission of *Lunacy* against them, after they have been so long possess'd of a reputable Character. Yes; this Learned Author seems conscious, at last, of putting hard Usage upon the *Council*: And thus, after having arraign'd their Memory, and plunder'd them of Common Sense; he returns them their Wits again, to argue the better against their Honesty.

The *Defender* inferr'd from the Council in *Trullo*, that the Passages in *S. Basil's* and *S. Chrysostom's* Liturgies for the *Mixture* were not interpolated: And here the Conclusion is drawn only from the Authority of the Council. But the Author of *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. excepts to the Testimony of the *Trullan Fathers* concerning the *Mixture*, because they did not meet till the Year 680; that is, about 280 Years after *S. Basil* and *S. Chrysostom*: For, tho' *S. Basil* died somewhat before the Year 400, *S. Chrysostom* liv'd some time after. This moderate Distance of Time, notwithstanding, in our Author's Opinion, makes their Evidence questionable. But when we consider these Liturgies were publick Forms of Worship, drawn up by Bishops of the first Class, and constantly us'd in the *Eastern Church* where this Council sat, we can't object to their Testimony; especially as to so remarkable a Passage, as the Ingredients of the Sacramental Cup. If any one should object against the Authentickness of our *First Reformed Liturgy* us'd in 1549; if this Form should be pretended an uncertain Record; that some of the most solemn Passages were interpolated; and that the Credit was main'd by the Remoteness of the Interval; should any one, I say, object in this manner, the Plea would be counted very unreasonable. And yet this may answer to the Case; for the *Trullan Fathers*, supposing some of them 70 Years of Age, liv'd not much farther from *S. Chrysostom*, than we do from the Compilers of our *First Reformed Liturgy*. And tho' living Evidence can't hold up to this Length, yet Parliament-Rolls, Charters for Privileges of Man-

Mannours, for Patents of Honour, &c. will pass Muster in *Westminster-Hall*, with less than two hundred Witnesses of Figure to attest the Record.

But, says this Learned Author, if *Twice two hundred Witnesses* were to appear to testify for a Matter of Fact done six hundred years before any of them were born, they could never expect to carry the Cause. (e). I believe not, if they should pretend to know the Matter in the State of Pre-existence. But what, if they should produce an unquestionable Record? *Doomsday-Book* for Instance? This written Evidence, tho' above six hundred years old, would not be rejected: And is not the Practice of the Universal Church, the Authority of the most Ancient *Fathers*, and the Testimony of *S. Basil*, that many Apostolical Usages were *Traditionary*; I say, is not all this equivalent to the Evidence for *Doomsday-Book*, which is no more than the Record for a single Nation?

Besides, this Author is somewhat wide in his Chronology. He supposes *S. James* dead six hundred years before the *Trullan* Fathers were born: Now, allowing some of the Bishops but sixty years old when they sat, his Computation must fall into a Mistake of above twenty years; but I shan't stand with him for that.

He endeavours to discredit the Authority of the *Fathers* in *Trullo*, by an Instance of the second Council of Nice. This Council, says he, was held in the very next Age (f). It might have been

(e) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 95.

(f) *Id.* p. 96.

said a hundred and seven years after. But, as our Author goes on, 'twas held with a more numerous Assembly, and yet decreed the *Worship of Images*. To this, besides the sufficient Answer made by a Learned Gentleman (g), may be subjoin'd, that the thirty second Canon of the Council in *Trullo*, now before us, pass'd without Exception, both in that Age and downwards, and settled nothing but what had been establish'd in the Council of *Carthage* in the Fourth Century; whereas the Canon for Image-Worship, decreed by the second Council of *Nice*, was immediately rejected by the *Western Church*. 'Tis severely censur'd by the *Caroline Books*, by the Councils of *Frankfort* and *Paris*, and by a Remonstrance of the then *English Church* (h). To which we may add, that this second *Nicene Council* decreed counter, concerning Images, to what had pass'd in a Synod at *Constantinople* about thirty Years before; from whence we may collect, that great Numbers, even of the *Eastern Part* of Christendom, were of a contrary Sentiment. And thus the Parallel being destroy'd, his Inference falls with it.

And here I can't well forbear observing, that this Learned Gentleman must needs be acquainted with these Publick Exceptions to the second *Nicene Council*; and therefore 'tis somewhat odd to see him draw a Comparison, and argue from one

(g) *The Necessity of an Alteration, &c.* p. 205.

(h) *Concil. Labbee*, Tom. VII. p. 922, & deinc. & p. 1057.  
 1647, 1648. *De Marca, de Concord. &c.* Lib. VI. c. 25. *Du Pin*  
*Nouvelle Bibliotheque*, &c. Tom. V. Paris 1691. 8vo. *Hoviden*  
*Annal.* Pars prior, p. 232.



*Synod* to the other. And tho' I won't suppose he has shrunk up his Understanding, as some People do their Arms; yet it must be said, his Memory has fail'd him, upon no very serviceable Occasion.

Upon the whole, nothing can be plainer than this *Council* in *Trullo's* Declaration for the *Mixture*. For don't these *Fathers* condemn the *Armenians* for administering the Sacramental Cup only in Wine? And here, amongst other Reasons for their Censure, do they not urge *S. Chrysostom's* Authority? Don't they expressly declare this *Father* taught the *Armenians* to administer with the *Mixture*? That this *Mixture* was an Apostolical Tradition in *S. Chrysostom's* Opinion? and that it represented the Blood and Water which flow'd from our Saviour's Side? And yet, after all, this Author won't allow *S. Chrysostom's* Testimony, cited by the *Council*, to infer his Belief of the Necessity of the *Mixture* (i). This is somewhat strange, considering this Saint affirms expressly, that the *Mixture* was an Emblem of a Miracle at our Saviour's Crucifixion; and that the *Hydroparata*, who consecrated the Cup with a single Ingredient, broke directly through an Apostolical Tradition. Now, if their Fault lay only in not making use of Wine, (as our Author would have it) why did he not rectify their Mistake? What made him enjoin them the *Mixture*? Why did he enforce his Injunction, by affirming, it represented the Blood and Water which flow'd from our Saviour's Side? And to say nothing farther, our Learned Author owns, the *Council* col-

(i) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 98.

lected from S. Chrysostom's Practice, that he believ'd the Mixture necessary, by vertue of Apostolical Tradition (k). To which he might have added, that they form'd their Censure of the Armenians, partly upon this Father's Authority. And all this put together may be enough, if not too much, to give the Reader the Sense of S. Chrysostom, and the Trullan Council.

The *No Reason*, &c. objects (l), "That if our Saviour design'd his Followers should celebrate the Holy Eucharist in Water as well as Wine, he would have told them so. To this the *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. (m) desires a clear Answer. The Answer is, our Saviour has told them so. He instituted the Eucharist in the Mixture, and commanded his Disciples to do as he had done. That our Saviour instituted the Mixture, appears from his administering in the *Paschal-Cup*, from the known Meaning of the *Fruit of the Vine*, from the Testimony of the *Ancient Fathers* and *Councils*, and from the Practice of the Universal Church.

Our Learned Author, instead of answering the Question put by the *Defender* to prove the *Fruit of the Vine* imply'd a Mixture of Water in it, returns several Questions of his own. To mention some of these Interrogatories which look towards the Purpose: Did our Saviour, says our Author, institute this Holy Ordinance for the Jews only, and not for the Gentiles too (n)? I answer

---

(k) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 98.

(l) *Pag.* 35.

(m) *Pag.* 100.

(n) *Id.* p. 101.

in the Affirmative, the Ordinance was instituted for the *Gentiles* in common with the *Jews*. And what follows? *Why then would he not do it in Language plainly intelligible by them as well as the Jews* (o)? Yes, the Language was plainly intelligible to the *Gentiles*: 'Twas made so by Apostolical Practice and Tradition (p), the Primitive Christians understood it so, and the whole Catholick Church consecrated with that Construction for 1500 years together. And as for the Essentiality of the *Mixture*, it evidently follows from our Saviour's commanding the Disciples *to do as He had done*. I am somewhat surpriz'd to find our Author perplex'd about accounting for the *Jewish* Phraseology of the *Fruit of the Vine*; as if Foreign Nations were out of Condition of reaching the Words: And that so easy a Matter could not be explain'd by those inspir'd Missionaries who converted them. I say explain'd, tho' considering the Custom of drinking diluted Wine, and the common Manner of speaking, there seems little need of Explanation. For if Wine, tho' diluted with an Over-Proportion of Water, carry'd an uncompounded Name, and was call'd *Wine*, what hinders but that the *Fruit of the Vine* might easily be understood in the same Sense, especially when they were directed by constant Practice so to understand it (q)? Farther; this Learned Author knows, there is a great deal of *Hebrew* and *Syriack*

---

(o) *Id.* p. 101.

(p) See Justin Martyr's *Apology* above cited.

(q) *Plut. de Sanitate tuenda.*

Phraseology in the *Old and New Testament*. Now because this Manner of speaking is uncommon and peculiar to one Country, does it follow from this *Peculiarity*, that the *Bible* was not design'd for the Benefit of the *Gentile World*?

To prevent the Objection which possibly might be made from *Water* not being expressly mention'd by the *Evangelists* in their Description of the Eucharistick Institution, the Author of the *Reasons*, &c. observ'd, that "when *Moses* sprink-  
" led the People with the *Blood of the Covenant*,  
" there's no mention of *Water* being mixt with  
" it: And yet the Apostle assures us, that *Moses*  
" took the *Blood* with *Water* (r). And here we  
are to take Notice, that the *Sprinkling of Blood*  
was a solemn Rite in the *Mosaick Covenant*:  
'Twas to give the *Israelites* an Assurance their  
Sins were forgiven (s). If *Moses* therefore had  
mixt *Water* with the *Blood*, of his own Head, as  
our Author speaks (t), how could he have de-  
serv'd the Apostle's Commendation of being  
*Faithful, as a Servant, in all his House* (u)? The  
throwing in an uncommanded Usage upon an  
expiating Ceremony, and upon so solemn an Oc-  
casion, would have been down-right adding to the  
Divine Commands, which is so plainly forbidden  
in his Book of *Deuteronomy* (w). And if *Moses*  
was commanded to mix *Water* with the *Blood*,  
tho' this Command is unmention'd in the *Penta-*

(r) *Heb. ix. 19.*(s) *Heb. ix. 22.*(t) *No Sufficient Reason, &c. p. 103.*(u) *Heb. iii. 5.*(w) *Deut. xii. 32.*



*teuch*, then the Argument in the *Reasons*, &c. and *Defence*, &c. holds good.

This Gentleman takes Check at the *Flourishes* that are coming upon him in the *Defence*, &c. (x) He has likewise been somewhat uneasy about the *Rhetorick*, it seems, that Author has bestow'd in reporting the *Trullan Council*. Now, tho' the *Defender* puts up no claim to Elocution, yet if something of that kind should happen, I can't imagine why any body should reckon it false *Logick*, or be disturb'd about it. *Rhetorick* is nothing but Reason well dress'd: And does our Author believe a good Suit of Cloaths will weaken the Use of a Man's Limbs, cramp his Motion, and bring him towards a Palsy or Consumption? To entertain, if one could do it, is a Respect to the *Reader*: And if Ornament conveys Reason with more Force and Perspicuity, where's the Harm on't?

To come forward to our Learned Author's Exceptions. He will have it, the *Defender* affirms that the *Fathers who lived so long as Miracles and Propheying lasted, were inspir'd* (y). This is Misreport. 'Tis true, the *Defender* demonstrated that Propheying and other supernatural Gifts were common in *Irenæus's* time, when the *Mixture of Miracles and Prayer for the Dead* were used. That *Miracles* were not uncommon in the *Primitive Times*, may be prov'd from the Authorities of *Irenæus, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, S. Cyprian, S. Augustine*, to mention no more: And tho' these

(x) P. 49. *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 103.

(y) *Ibid.*

*Fathers* Testimony is no Part of the *Canon*, yet a Man must be a great *Sceptick*, and not fit to argue with, who disbelieves them. Won't our Author believe there was such a Man as *Julius Caesar*, because neither his Person, nor his *Commentaries*, are mention'd in the *New Testament*? Are we always to call out, with Mr. *Toland*, to the *Law* and to the *Testimony* (z)? And can't we give Credit to a Matter of Fact unmention'd in the *Holy Text*, without going off from the *Rule of Scripture* (a)? But this Gentleman will reply, that in Matters of Faith and Worship, we ought to rest wholly upon the *Canon*. However, he seems to have forgotten, the *Defender* observ'd we were bound to believe the *Scriptures* the Word of God: And that the Inspiration of the *Canon* could not be prov'd without *Traditionary* Evidence. And that this Reasoning holds, our Learned Author is forced to confess. For he tells us, *we are indebted to Tradition for our Knowledge of the Scriptures* (b). But, continues he, *if the Fathers were not infallibly inspir'd* (c): Infallibly inspir'd! I thought all Inspiration had been infallible: But let that pass. *If the Fathers, then, were not infallibly inspir'd, why should as great Stress be laid upon their Sayings, as if they had been so* (d)? I hope we had very good Reason to believe an Evidence, tho' those were neither Prophets, nor Apostles, that gave it.

---

(z) *Nazarenus*, p. 82.

(a) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 104.

(b) *Id.* p. 34.

(c) *Id.* p. 103.

(d) *Id.* p. 104.

The Canon of Scripture rests upon human Conveyance; are we therefore to question the Truth of these Sacred Records because the Attestation through the succeeding Ages was not Inspir'd? Well! But *why should so great a Stress be laid upon these Fathers as if they were Inspir'd (e)?* He has not prov'd the *Defender* lays this Stress. But besides, I desire to ask him, whether we may not believe *Doomsday-Book* an Authentick Manuscript, without laying the same Stress upon the Contents, which we do upon the Gospel of S. Matthew? And lastly, I intreat to be resolv'd, whether those Ages so near the Apostles, so remarkable for Miracles and Martyrdom, are not better Evidence for the *Mixture*, than some of the Sixteenth Century for omitting it, where these Credentials for Knowledge and Sincerity cannot be produced?

He complains of the *Defender's* taking notice, the *Answerer* offer'd nothing but *Conjecture* upon *Conjecture* against the *Mixture (f)*. Now I desire to know, whether when there's nothing but remote Possibility on one side, and good Evidence on the other, which way the Verdict ought to be given? To argue from bare unsupported Conjecture against consentient Tradition, against the Testimony of *Jews* and *Christians* of the First Ages, against the Practice of the Universal Church for 1500 Years together: To argue in this Manner, is much the same Logick, as it

---

(e) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 104.

(f) *Id.* p. 105.

would

would be to affirm, that a single Grain in one Scale is more than Counterpoise to a Pound in the other.

He complains, that neither the *Reasons*, nor the *Defence*, &c. have shew'd the Distinction between the *Fruit of the Vine*, and the *Fruit of the Tree*, as ancient as our Saviour's Time (f). Now, since the *Talmud*, from whence this Distinction was cited, was, as to the *Misna* Part, compiled soon after the *Jews* were banished their Country by *Adrian*, and contains a Collection of old *Jewish* Customs, it might fairly be expected that this Gentleman should have prov'd this Distinction, and the Use of the *Paschal Mixture*, of later Original. However, to give him farther Satisfaction, I shall

1<sup>st</sup>, Shew the *Paschal Mixture* call'd the *Fruit of the Vine* in the *Misna*. And, 2<sup>dly</sup>, prove the *Misna* an unexceptionable Authority.

But before I do this, it may be requisite to speak to his Exceptions against the *Talmud*, and shew that the Testimonies produced by him don't affect the Citation concerning the *Mixture*. To go over what he has offer'd (g). His Report of *Justinian's* Judgment of the *Misna* does no Business. The Emperor says only, that this *Collection* was no more than Human Composition, and drawn up by Men uninspir'd (h). Who denies This? Did the *Defender* cite the *Talmud* for Part of the *Canon*? But may it not be a Book of Credit, and relate matter of Fact fairly, with-

(f) Page 108.

(g) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 74.

(h) *Novel. Const.* 146.



out this supernatural Advantage? Or, are we to believe no History, but what is in the *Bible*? Can any Reasoning be more foreign and inconclusive than this? His Testimony from *Sixtus Senensis*, *Simonville*, Bishop *Walton*, and Dr. *Prideaux*, prove no farther, than that the *Talmud* has a great many idle and superstitious Observances, and Relations in't. And who doubts that? But does it follow, that we must depend upon nothing there reported? By no means. That this Consequence can't be drawn, may be made good from the Authorities cited by himself, and from other Vouchers of Figure in our own Nation. For,

“ Bishop *Walton* says, that these *Talmudic* Explanations are not wholly to be rejected, provided they are neither whimsical, nor pretend to Divine Authority (i).

And Dr. *Prideaux*, notwithstanding his Abatement of Character, with respect to the *Babylonish Talmud*: For 'tis only this which he compares in some Measure with the *Alcoran* (k): But as to the *Misna* and *Jerusalem-Talmud*, he tells us, “ the First was compos'd about the Year 150 of our Lord, and the other about 300. That the Proverbial Sayings, and Phraseology used in our Saviour's Time, might very well be preserved in them: And that Dr. *Lightfoot* hath made very good Use of these Books in explaining several Places of the *New Testament* (l). But this having been produced more

---

(i) *In Bibl. Prolegom.*

(k) *Prideaux Connexion*, &c. p. 328.

(l) *Ibid.* p. 328.

at large against our Author already, I need say no more about it (m).

I shall now proceed to shew the *Paschal Mixture* call'd the *Fruit of the Vine* in the *Misna*.

The *Misna*, describing the Ceremonies for the *Paschal Cup*, runs thus: "When they mix the First Cup, both the Schools of *Shammai* and *Hillel* Bless, or give Thanks for the Wine. The Second and Third Cup are likewise mixt (n).

The Blessing, or Thanksgiving over the mixt Wine, was, Blessed art Thou, O Lord, "who createst the Fruit of the Vine (o).

As for *Shammai* and *Hillel*, they were two eminent *Elders*, or *Fathers of Tradition*, who liv'd in *Augustus* and *Herod the Great's* Time, and consequently before our Saviour's Passion (p). This shews that the *Jews* mixt the *Paschal Cup*, and then call'd it the *Fruit of the Vine*, when our Saviour instituted the holy Eucharist.

(m) *Tradition necessary to explain the Holy Scriptures, &c.* p. 166, 167.

(n) מוגו לו כוס ראשון בית שמאי ואמריים מברך על היום ואחר כך מברך על היין ובית הלל אמרי מברך על היין ואח כן מברך על היום. *Mischna, Pesachim, cap. 10. § 2.*

Id. § 4. מוגו לו כוס שני.

Id. § 7. מוגו לו כוס שלישי.

(o) כיצד מברכין על הפירות על פירות האילן אומר בורא פרי העץ. חוץ מן היין שעל היין אומר בורא פרי הגפן. *Mischna, Berachoth, cap. 6. §. 1.*

(p) *Misna, Shabbath & Eruvin. Dr. Wotton. vol. 2. p. 13.*

Dr. Lightfoot, in his *Horæ Hebraicæ*, from the *Misna*, *Gemarists*, and *Maimonides*, speaks thus: "The *Paschal* Supper began with a Cup of mixt Wine; and then the chief Person gave God Thanks, *who created the Fruit of the Vine*. This Cup was diluted, because their Wine was very strong, and not fit to be drank without Water: This was one Reason (q). The same Learned Doctor, in his Comment upon the Eucharistick Cup in the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, observes, "1<sup>st</sup>, That in striking the Old Covenant (r), there was Blood mixt with Water (s): And in this Sanction of the *New*, there was Wine also mixt with Water. 2<sup>dly</sup>, Out of Christ's Side Water flow'd with Blood: Unusual this; and beside the Course of Nature, that it might answer the Type (t). And in his *Temple Service*, cited in the *Reasons*, &c. he mentions the Proportion of Water which was to dilute the Wine: And then takes Notice, "That the *Talmudick Rubrick* for the *Paschal Night's Service*, whenever it speaks of any of these Cups of Wine brought to him that officiated, uses this Expression, *וּמִיּוֹן לֵי*, *They mingled it for him* (u). And what was deliver'd by *Rabb* in the *Gemara*, is received among them as a current Maxim; That whosoever drank these four Cups of pure Wine, he indeed had done his Duty about drinking Wine; but he

(q) *Hor. Hebraic. in Matth. Tom. 2. p. 257.*

(r) *Exod. xxiv.*

(s) *Heb. ix. 19.*

(t) *Hor. Hebraic. in 1 Cor. xi. 25. Tom. 2. p. 777.*

(u) *Pesachim. per. 10. Part of the Misna.*

“ had not done his Duty about setting forth  
 “ their Freedom (x). And thus, *the invincible*  
*Rubb*, our Author talks of, is easily got over (y).

Then as to the Distinction between the *Fruit of the Vine*, and the *Fruit of the Tree*, cited in the *Reasons and Defence*, &c. from Dr. *Lightfoot*, 'tis taken from the *Gemara* of the *Talmud*. Now this *Gemara*, written by their most eminent Doctors, was design'd to explain and dilate upon the Customs briefly reported in the *Misna*. And thus, tho' this *Distinction* is much the least Part of what we are concern'd in, there's no reason to question the Antiquity of it. I come now

2dly, To prove the *Misna* an unexceptionable Authority. Dr. *Lightfoot*, in his *Preface to Hora Hebraica*, informs us, “ That the *New Testament*  
 “ every where tastes of, and retains the *Jews*  
 “ Style, Idiom, Form, and Rule of Speaking.  
 “ — That the best way of searching out the  
 “ Sense of the many obscure Places in the *New*  
 “ Testament, is to enquire in what Sense those  
 “ Phrases and Manners of Speech were under-  
 “ stood according to the common Dialect of that  
 “ Nation: That this Enquiry could succeed no  
 “ other way, than by consulting *Talmudick* Au-  
 “ thors, who both speak the vulgar Dialect, and  
 “ reveal all *Jewish* Matters (z). The Text of  
 “ the Gospel has no plainer Interpreters, than  
 “ these Writers. — And Christians by their

(x) *Lightfoot*, vol. 1. p. 961.

(y) *No sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 107.

(z) *Hor. Hebraic. Tom. 2. p. 93. Edit. Lond. fol.*



“ Skill and Industry, may render them most use-  
 “ ful to their Studies, and most eminently ser-  
 “ viceable to the Interpretation of the *New*  
 “ *Testament* (a). This Testimony, which takes  
 in the *Gemara* with the *Misna*, the *Reader*, I  
 conceive, will conclude, comes full to the Pur-  
 pose.

To proceed: The Learned Dr. *Wotton*, with  
 Dr. *Prideaux*, fixes the Compiling the *Misna*  
 to the Reign of *Antoninus Pius*; and observes,  
 “ we need not question but that the Tradi-  
 “ tions that were received by their wise Men,  
 “ who liv’d while the Second Temple stood,  
 “ are there preserv’d with great Integrity (b).  
 “ That wherever the *Misna* gives Light to any  
 “ Custom, Passage, or Phrase mentioned in  
 “ the *Old* and *New Testament*, its Light may  
 “ certainly be depended upon. That the Au-  
 “ thority of the *Misna* is to be look’d on as the  
 “ Voice of the *Jewish Nation*. — That this  
 “ Consideration led Dr. *Lightfoot* to take so  
 “ much pains to illustrate the most considerable  
 “ Books of the *New Testament*, out of the *Tal-*  
 “ *mudick* Writers: And since there is not one  
 “ single Instance that can be produc’d out of the  
 “ *Evangelists*, of any *Jewish* Tradition, or Cu-  
 “ stom, there hinted at, or expressly mention’d,  
 “ which cannot be verifiy’d by the *Misna*, it un-

(a) *Id.* p. 94.

(b) *Miscellaneous Discourses relating to the Traditions and*  
*Usages of the Scribes, &c. in our Saviour’s Time.* Preface,  
 v, vi.

“ deniably proves the very great Use which  
 “ has been, and may still be farther made of  
 “ that Book, to illustrate the Sayings of our Bles-  
 “ sed Lord, and the Reasonings of the Apostles  
 “ and *Evangelists* (c). — ’Tis the Ritual  
 “ Part of the *Gemara*, which can be chiefly use-  
 “ ful to us Christians. — And as for the  
 “ *Misna*, when ’tis positive and explicite for any  
 “ Usage, (as it is for the *Mixture* in the  
 “ *Paschal Cup*) we may, and I think ought to  
 “ take it for granted, that that Usage was pra-  
 “ ctis’d in the Time of *Jesus Christ* and his A-  
 “ postles (d).

That *Maimonides*, cited in the *Reasons*, &c.  
 is of some Authority, appears from what is quo-  
 ted in his Favour in the *No Reason*, &c. from the  
 Learned *Buxtorf*, משה עד משה לא קם כמשה,  
 from *Moses to Moses there never arose any like*  
*Moses*: And that this *Moses Maimonides* is a  
 good Voucher, the Reader may be farther in-  
 form’d from the Learned *Dr. Wotton*. His  
 Words are these: “ The *Rabbanists* have, ever  
 “ since the *Misnick Doctors* first arose, steadily  
 “ adher’d to their Doctrines: This is so vi-  
 “ sible, that *Dr. Lightfoot*, and indeed most  
 “ other Christians, who have been skill’d in  
 “ these Things, have quoted *Maimonides*,  
 “ tho’ he liv’d about a thousand years after  
 “ the *Misna* was written, as competent Autho-  
 “ rity to ascertain any *Jewish Traditions*; as  
 “ having found by long Experience, that the Ri-

(c) *Id.* p. viii, ix.(d) *Id.* p. xxxi, xxxii.

“ *tualists* have faithfully represented the Sense of  
 “ the ancientest Doctors that went before them (d).  
 And after a great deal of Learning and Argu-  
 ment upon this Head, he concludes thus :

“ 'Tis plain now what Authority Christians  
 “ may safely pay to the *Misna* ; it shews us how  
 “ the *Chain of Tradition* stood in *Jesus Christ's*  
 “ Time (e).

The celebrated Orientalist Mr. *Ockley*, Arabick-  
 Professor at *Cambridge*, shall close the Evidence.  
 The Testimony is in his Letter to Dr. *Wotton*, and  
 stands in the *Postscript* of the Volume last cited.  
 Some of the Paragraphs to our Purpose are these :

“ Your Design being to prove that the *Body* of  
 “ those *Traditions* collected by R. *Judah* in the  
 “ *Misna*, are in the main the same with those in  
 “ Use in our Saviour's Time, I am so far from  
 “ doubting the Truth of it, that I should won-  
 “ der what any Man meant that should que-  
 “ stion it.

“ The *Misna* is undoubtedly a very venerable  
 “ Piece of Antiquity, collected with great Judge-  
 “ ment, and digested with the utmost Exactness,  
 “ by that great and Learned Rabbi *Judah* ; a Per-  
 “ son, whom none since the Destruction of the  
 “ *Temple*, that we know of, had greater Advan-  
 “ tages both of Wisdom, Learning, Riches, and  
 “ Interest, to furnish him with all the Mate-  
 “ rials necessary for the completing so great a  
 “ Work.

(d) *Id.* p. 108, 109.

(e) *Id.* p. 118. Vol. I.

And

And now, since the *Mixture* in the *Paschal Cup* is plainly asserted in the *Misna*, and since the Customs reported in the *Misna* hold up to our Saviour's Time, I hope we may have satisfy'd the Demand of sufficient Antiquity for this Usage: And now this Point being clear'd, there's little Occasion for accounting for the Phraseology of the *Fruit of the Vine*, and the *Fruit of the Tree*; for in regard this *Distinction* was remark'd only to make good the *Mixture* of the *Paschal Cup*; since this *Mixture* has been prov'd already, the other might fairly be dismiss'd. However, that the remaining Scruple (if there is any) may be discharg'd, this Part of the Objection shall be consider'd.

The *Jews* Distinction between the *Fruit of the Vine*, and the *Fruit of the Tree*, was reckon'd great Impropriety by the *No Reason*, &c. (f) "If the *Jews* would talk impertinently, says he, "I can't think it necessary our Lord should do so too. This the *Defender* thought too strong a Turn. The Author of *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. (g) is surpriz'd at this Remark, and would gladly know where the *Fault lies*? I'll tell him then: There's Levity in the Expression. And we owe a greater Regard to the Divine Majesty, than to bring him in for Diversion, and give him a Share in furnishing a Jest. I'm sorry to find his Taste so undistinguishing: But he is resolv'd to hold his Fancy, and give the *Jews* Leave to use their Language as impertinently as

(f) Pag. 42.

(g) Pag. 109.



they please; only 'tis desir'd, if they make an improper use on't, our Blessed Saviour may not be brought into the Scrape with them (h). 'Tis desir'd our Blessed Saviour, that is, God Almighty, may not be brought into the Scrape. Brought into the Scrape! A solemn and august Expression! and awfully apply'd to the Supreme Being! And to mend the Matter, the *impertinent Jews* are the honourable Company mention'd upon this Occasion! And now, Good Sir, what do you think on't? Is not here an open *manquement de respect*, a Forgetfulness of Distance, an apparent Failure in Reverence and Regard? But this is the Misfortune of Over-straining for Wit. I'm mistaken, if this Way of talking is not much more remote from Propriety, than the Distinction between the *Fruit of the Vine*, and the *Fruit of the Tree*.

However, this Distinction won't pass without Impertinence with our Learned Author: But notwithstanding his Severity, I believe it may be fairly accountable. For, omitting the *Eastern Phrasology*, and some Expressions incommunicable to other Languages; omitting this, why might not the *Jews*, who generally drank the *Mixture*, call diluted Wine the *Fruit of the Vine*, especially since they drank it mixt with Water for Pleasure, as well as Health? Thus, for Instance, they diluted the *Paschal Cup*, because it struck more agreeably upon the Palate, and was a more lively Representation of their Deliverance from Slavery in *Egypt*. And why, since Wine was the more no-

---

(h) *Ibid*;

ble Ingredient, might it not give Name to the Composition, and be call'd *the Fruit of the Vine*? This Language was common to more Countries than *Judea*; for, as has been observ'd from *Plutarch*, diluted Liquor, tho' there was more of the *Well* than of the *Grape* in't, was call'd *Wine*. Then, as for the *Fruit of the Tree*, what Impertinence is there in that? Don't we say Fruit tastes of the *Tree*, when it comes somewhat rugged to the Sense, and enters with Abatement of Pleasure? And if undiluted Wine was less acceptable to a *Few*, why might they not make the Difference of their Sensation from resembling Experiment, from their Distinction upon the Testimony of their Senses, and call that *the Fruit of the Tree*, which was less obliging to the Palate? And since this Distinction is founded in Things, easy in the Terms, intelligible in the Emblem, and fairly defensible, I hope 'twill not be an unreasonable Liberty, to suppose our Blessed Saviour us'd the Phraseology of his Country, and spoke the *Paschal* Language at the *Paschal* Solemnity.

The *Defender* put this Question; "If Water" may be omitted, why not Wine? To this our Learned Author returns, *because our Saviour plainly tells us what he instituted was the Fruit of the Vine, but says not one word concerning Water* (i). But this is no Answer, considering it has been plainly prov'd the *Mixture* is meant by the *Fruit of the Vine*.

---

(i) *No Sufficient Reason, &c. p. 113.*

The *Defender* affirm'd the Author of *No Reason*, &c. mistaken in saying, "we hear nothing of a Cup purposely mixt for this Use till the *Apostolical Constitutions* : And that this Assertion was prov'd a Mistake, from the Testimonies of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *S. Cyprian* (k). To this our Learned Author replies, *He can't find these Authorities are produc'd for any thing more, than to prove that our Saviour us'd a Mixture* (l). And is not our Saviour's Practice upon so Solemn an Occasion, a binding Reason for Imitation? especially when he bid his Disciples do what He had done? Indeed the Testimonies produc'd reach both our Lord's Precedent and Command. *Justin Martyr* acquaints the Emperor, that the Christians blest'd the Eucharistick Wine and Water, and receiv'd it mixt (m). *Ireneus* makes the Eucharistick Mixture a Representation of Christ's Human and Divine Nature (n) : And *S. Cyprian* declares, that neither the Water without the Wine, nor the Wine without the Water, was our Saviour's Institution (o). And could they say all this, without supposing the Cup mixt on Purpose at the Administration? These Testimonies the *Defender* thought prior to the *Apostolical Constitutions* ; I mean, as to the Form that Book stands in at present. And if this Gentleman is of a differ-

---

(k) *Defence*, &c. p. 58.

(l) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 114.

(m) *Apol.* 2.

(n) *Iren. Lib. V. c. 1. Edit. Grabe.*

(o) *Epist. 63. ad Cæcilian.*

rent Opinion, he will get nothing by it. For by this Disagreement he'll give those *Constitutions*, which are so plain for the *Mixture*, a more *Primo-Primitive Authority*. And thus, tho' as the *Reasoner* and *Defender* argued, that 'twas most reasonable to suppose, "that the Eucharistick Cup, "bless'd by our Saviour, was Part of that prepar'd "for the *Passover* ; yet 'twill by no means follow, that the *Primo-Primitive Christians* did not mix the Cup purposely for this Sacrament. For the *Christians* did not keep the *Jewish Passover*, where the Cup was already mixt : And therefore unless they mixt it on Purpose, they would have acted short of our Lord's Institution, who commanded them to drink as he had done. And now our Learned Author must come furnish'd with New Light and Penetration, before the *Contradiction* he talks of, between the *Reasons* and *Defence*, &c. can be discover'd.

The *Defender*, to prove it does not appear our Saviour kept the *Passover* with unleaven'd Bread, observ'd from Dr. *Hammond*, that 'twas not necessary the *Jews Houses* should be clear'd of all *Unleaven'd Bread*, till the Evening of the fourteenth Day, when the Lamb was to be eaten (p) *These Words*, says our Learned Author, are not to be found in *Hammond* (q). If the same Words are not, the same Sense plainly is, which one would think is enough for the Purpose. Dr. *Hammond's Words*, cited by our Author, who omit Part of them, are these : *This Day of the Passover*

(p) *Defence*, &c. p. 59.

(q) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 116.



being the Eve or Preparation of the seven Days Feast of Unleavened Bread, they were that Day before Sun-set (that is, before the fifteenth Day began) to purge out, or remove all Remainders of Leaven'd Bread out of their Houses (r). Here this Learned Annotator asserts, they were to clear their Houses of all Leaven'd Bread before the fifteenth Day began: And if this Time was given them, does it not plainly follow, that their doing it upon any Part of the fourteenth Day was soon enough, and answer'd the Command? I'm sorry to see our Author deny such staring Evidence. Farther, our Learned Author grants, that our Blessed Saviour *did not keep the Passover at the proper Time*; that is, on the Day appointed by the Jewish Law; that he *did not eat the Paschal Lamb, because he was to be offer'd before the time for eating it* (s). Now, if our Blessed Lord dispens'd with the Day, and with the Lamb, with the most material Parts of the Mosaic Institution, why not with that which seems less significant? I say less significant, because the Jews were not bound to remove the Leaven till the End of the fourteenth Day, nor to eat unleaven'd Bread till the fifteenth began. And since the Reasons lie so strong against our Author, 'tis his Business to prove our Saviour kept the Passover with Unleaven'd Bread: And yet, if he could do this, 'twill by no means reach home to his Point (t).

(r) Hammond. *Annotat. on S. Mark xiv. c.*

(s) *No Sufficient Reason, &c. p. 116, 117.*

(t) See *Defence, &c. p. 61. The Necessity of an Alteration, &c.*

It being suppos'd in the *No Reason*, &c. (u)  
 " That our Saviour took the mixt Cup only be-  
 " cause 'twas ready at hand : The *Defender* put  
 this Question ; " Why will it not follow for the  
 " same Reason, that he made use of Wine only  
 " because it was ready ? And then the Inference  
 " will be, that there's no lasting Obligation to  
 " communicate in Wine, but any other Drink  
 " may serve as well (x).

To this our Learned Author replies, he can't  
 suppose our Saviour would by any means have acted  
 with so little Consideration, and so unreasonably, as  
 this Question insinuates (y). But here he is some-  
 what near striking upon the old Rock : He borders  
 upon making himself the Judge of what is reasona-  
 ble for our Saviour. Tho' we are told expressly that  
*God's Thoughts are far above, and not like ours* (z).  
 And that a human Understanding is vastly short  
 of a Measure for the Divine. The first Part of  
 our Author's Argument from the *Types of the Old*  
*Testament* has been answer'd in speaking to the  
*Drink-Offering*. And as to the Redness of the  
 Wine, because 'tis the best *Resemblance of Blood* ;  
 I'll grant the Colour, if he insists on't : But then  
 he must allow, that if Wine was drank only be-  
 cause 'twas red, and ready ; then 'twill follow,  
 that any red Liquor at hand may be made Use  
 of for that Purpose.

He says, the *Defender* has not prov'd the *Mix-  
 ture Essential* (a). The *Defender* has prov'd our  
 Blessed Saviour drank the *Mixture*, and com-

(u) Pag. 47, 48.

(x) *Defence*, &c. p. 60.

(y) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 118.

(z) *Isa. lv.*

(a) *No Sufficient Reason*, &c. p. 119.

manded the Disciples to do what he had done : And that the Apostles, and the Universal Church practis'd accordingly. And if this is not enough to prove the Essentiality, I desire this Gentleman would inform me what is.

And now, having glean'd up the Objections left me by the two Learned Authors abovementioned (b); my Business with the *No Sufficient Reason's* First Part is at an End. However, before I take leave, it may not be amiss just to touch upon the Heads handled to Satisfaction by these Learned Gentlemen. To begin :

This Author's Charge, that we set up *Tradition* in Opposition to Scripture, is disprov'd at large (c). And 'tis likewise shewn that the Writing the *New Testament* was not design'd to supersede the Use of Tradition (d). His Attempt to set aside the Scripture Authorities for Tradition, made unserviceable (e). His Assertion, that Scripture, and not Tradition, is prescrib'd by our Saviour, prov'd foreign to his Purpose (f). His Authorities from the *Fathers*, that Scripture alone is the Rule of Christian Worship, disabled, and Counter Testimonies produced (g). His Objection of Interpolation in the *Apostolical Con-*

(b) *Tradition Necessary to explain, and interpret the Holy Scriptures, &c. The Necessity of an Alteration, &c.*

(c) *Tradition Necessary to explain the Holy Scriptures, &c. p. 143, & alib.*

(d) *Id. p. 118, 119.*

(e) *Id. p. 142. and The Necessity of an Alteration, &c. p. 153.*

(f) *Tradition Necessary, &c. p. 142. & deinc.*

(g) *Tradition Necessary, &c. p. 147, to 164. The Necessity of an Alteration, &c. p. 155, to 174.*

*situation*, and other Ancient *Liturgies*, confuted; so far at least as the present Controversy is concern'd (h). His Instance in the *Charter of London* against the Usefulness of Tradition, prov'd foreign and misapply'd (i). His Reasoning from a Passage in *S. Cyril of Jerusalem*, concerning our Saviour's changing the Water into Wine, at the Feast of *Cana*, and not into Water and Wine: Add that *S. Cyril* makes no Difference between this Wine, and that which he made his Blood: This Reasoning, I say, is shewn to be over-strain'd, and inconclusive; and I am afraid bordering upon Transubstantiation: I say Transubstantiation; for the Passage in *S. Cyril* stands thus: *Since our Saviour changed the Water into Wine at the Feast of Cana in Galilee, why can't he as well change the Wine into his Blood* (k)? Now if the Parallel must be press'd close, bear on all Parts, and be driven Home to a Physical Conformity, will it not follow, that since the Water at *Cana* was really and substantially changed into Wine, the Eucharistick Wine must be as substantially changed into our Saviour's Blood (l)? This is the Consequence of our Learned Author's Reasoning, who, for the sake of his Cause, interprets this Passage of the Holy Father in favour of Transubstantiation, tho' contrary to the Intention of the Saint.

(h) *Tradition Necessary*, &c. p. 120, 10. 133.

(i) *Id.* p. 190.

(k) *Catech. Mystag.* iv. p. 292.

(l) *The Necessity of an Alteration*, &c. p. 174.



The Advantage he endeavours to draw from S. Chrysostom's Homily upon *Matth. xxvi.* that our Saviour gave his Disciples the *Fruit of the Vine*, and the Sacramental Cup being so call'd in S. Basil's Liturgy before 'tis suppos'd mixt: This Advantage is wrested from him, and his Dilemma from *κεραवास* broken (m). His Objection from the Etymology of *κεραυνους*, destroy'd; and that Word construed to *mix* by the common Usage of all Times (n). The Defender's Preference of Justin Martyr to Daillée, and his Reasoning from their respective Testimonies, made good (o). The Author of *No Sufficient Reason's* Argument from Irenæus's calling the Eucharistick Cup the *Creature*, and not the *Creatures*, shewn wide of the Purpose (p). His Instance from Theodorus Mopsuestenus to interpret *κεραυνον* no Mixture, answer'd from Origen, and other unexceptionable Evidence (q). His Instance likewise from Athanasius for the same Point, disabled by Argument and Authority (r). His Construction of the *Septuagint's* *ἐκέπασεν*, *Prov. ix. 2.* which he turns *poored out*, prov'd forc'd and foreign, from an indisputable Text of that *Version*, and from several Places in the Original *Hebrew* (s). His Exception from Irenæus's Dispute against the Ebionites, and his mooring upon the Word *Commixto* turn'd upon him, and that Water was Part of the Eucharistick Institution, evinc'd clearly from that *Father* (t).

(m) *The Necessity of an Alteration*, &c. p. 177, & deinc.

(n) *Id.* p. 181, 182.

(o) *Ibid.* & p. 183.

(p) *Id.* p. 184.

(q) *Id.* p. 187, 188.

(r) *Id.* p. 189, 190.

(s) *Id.* p. 191.

(t) *Id.* p. 192, 193.

His Testimony from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and from *S. Cyprian*, fully satisfy'd (u). The Defender vindicated in his Answer to the Objection against *Tradition*, drawn from the different Traditionary Customs of Pope *Victor* and the *Asiatick* Churches about the keeping *Easter*: And that the *Roman* and *Eastern* Churches standing so close to their respective Customs, shews plainly their Regard for *Tradition*, and the great Stress they laid upon it (x). And the last I shall mention, is a clear Testimony for the *Mixture* produc'd from *S. Jerom* (y).

Thus I have just touch'd upon most of the Places manag'd at large, and drawn out into Force and Consequence, by these Learned Gentlemen: But how the Damage will be repair'd, the Breaches made up, and the Loss recruited, lies beyond my Prospect, and must be left to our *Author's* Provision.

(u) *Id.* p. 35, 195, & *deint.*

(x) *Id.* p. 197, 198.

(y) *Id.* p. 202. *Comment. Hieron. in Marc. cap. 14.*

E R R A T A

Page 5, line 22. for *two and there* read *the second and third*.  
P. 19. l. 15. for *S. John's* read *John's*. P. 48. l. 12. for *make*  
read *mark*.

F I N I S